

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
Minutes of April 17, 2012 Meeting

Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, April 17, 2012.**

Present: Hal Hester, Harry Sherrill, Travis Haston, Jon Morris, Zeke Acosta, John Taylor, Rob Belisle, Kevin Silva, Elliot Mann and John Wood

Absent: Bernice Cutler, Tim West and Ed Horne

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The motion by John Wood seconded by Zeke Acosta to approve the March 20th, 2012 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No BDC Member comments.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No public attendee comments.

4. DEMO FEE CHANGES IN LUESA FEE ORDINANCE

On April 4th, a copy of the RFBA on Demo Fee Changes was sent to all BDC members. Patrick Granson, Jim Bartl, Don Willard and Bill Hardister are here to address questions that you have on the RFBA. Brief story, in 1997, in an effort to simplify the process for customers, the Department consolidated Demo Permit charges for the Health Department, Air Quality and Code into one payment process. The point is that the current Demo Fee structure is 15 years old and we have reached the point especially for Environmental Health and Air Quality you just covered their cost. We collect the fees and then we distribute it to different entities; and these are approximate figures on distribution. Air Quality gets 50%, Environmental Health gets 15%, Historic Landmarks gets 20-25% and Code Enforcement gets 15%. Recent studies indicate that LUESA is about 15% under covering service cost. This proposes a 20% fee increase and the target for that is to match the breakeven point in FY16 (collecting slightly more through FY16 and we would not adjust this again for another 8 years, so we are looking to balance this over an 8 year period.

JM: What costs are we recovering?

JB: Our cost in Code Enforcement is primarily to issue the permit, manage the process side (except they have some process that happens in their venue as well and also we send an inspector out when requested to be sure that the building is no longer there.

Don Willard explained what's involved on his end. Don thanked the Commission for the opportunity and consideration. We administer what is called the MSHAPS; asbestos demolition and renovation. It is a federal regulation that Mecklenburg County has a certified local program and we are required to administer state and federal regulations. Basically it's notification of inspections on demolitions and renovations. All we try to do is to recoup our cost. We haven't recouped our cost for years; due to personnel. I advocated 25% but we are asking for 20%.

ZA: Is it just the asbestos part you are dealing with or just any demolition?

DW: It applies to any demolition. It is a federal program and EPA has stretched the demolition definition as far as they can; the only demolitions that aren't included in MSHAPS are straight residential.

ZA: I have noticed a few commercial buildings demolished and the packaged heating and AC equipment stayed on the roof and just came down w/ refrigerant in it and was wondering if anybody was looking at that.

DW: That shouldn't be happening; if someone calls we try to contact the right people, it's become a federal specialized program.

HS: This increase will cover you until 2018?

DW: 2016

JB: These are theoretical calculations but we tried to do an estimate so that we weren't coming back to you even in four years, of where costs would be from 2012 to 2020 and then we shot for an average for 2016, it is a little

high for the first 4 years but a little low for the remaining 4 years so it should average out to what the costs are in 2016. We've not done this before but were the best way we felt to not come back to you a lot.

HS: Why isn't this tied with salary increases that we do every two year or periodically?

JB: We don't do increases every 2 years, and before we increased the fee in 2010; the last thing we did was reduce the fee back in 2006. Before that the most recent change was 2002.

HS: How do we estimate the fee cost; based upon demolition cost?

DW: Different agencies do it different ways. We are just trying to recoup our personnel cost.

JB: For a simple permit this may be the most complicated one to figure out where the balance point is because it is not just us. We are working on something that we spread between Gene's side and Patrick's side we can look at how much time Patrick has in it and how much time Gene has in it and can average it out over 10-15 projects and say that is what the cost is. In our case all we do is manage the permitting process and then we send an inspector out for one trip. It's pretty easy to put our finger on that and we know how often this happens and what the counts are. But on his side, he has a series of things he has to do and sometimes they will go out more than once and then Bill has a series of things, so they have different people involved at different costs and what we did in this case is we tried to identify (from 3 different perspectives) from our costs to his costs and what Bills were independently and we put the whole thing together in a pool and then we tried to forecast forward. Let's let Bill explain on his side what's involved:

Bill Hardister, the Environmental Division Director, from our standpoint we look at a number of different things. We respond to everyone of the requests onsite. We are looking to verify the application is accurate. We've managed referrals from Don's group where application showed no asbestos. We've seen issues with drums containing liquids that shouldn't be there before the demolition process starts. Primarily our responsibility to be looking at the buildings to ensure there are no rodent problems. If you demolish a building with rodent problems, they will spread to the neighboring areas. That's where our services come in to it. We are all on different models as well. Jim is an enterprise fund, Don is fee funded, and we are tax funded. One of our goals is that we recover at least 80% of our cost with fees/charges and we aren't doing that right now due to the extra money we have invested in demolition permits that is not being recovered.

JB: Another difference in this calculation we were trying to target 100% recovery for you and 100% for us and for him we are trying to recover 108% with different criteria.

RB: Is it a onetime lump sum fee or do you go out for 3 visits?

DW: One time. For the allocation the fee is based on the size of the structure and various factors and when that fee is paid at one time; this is what really started the whole thing; there were three fees the county wanted to combine so it's paid at one time under the guidelines and then the money is allocated.

RB: So for a 1000sf demo building; ballpark what is that?

JB: The RFBA shows you what we are going from and what we are going to. The specific question you have now currently a 10,000 sf building according to the fee ordinance is \$750 + \$250 and would go to \$900 + \$360 which is a 20% increase; which is a lump sum fee based on the size.

RB: Why don't we have an automatic (cost of living index) each year, and based on the construction index you automatically bump up your fee 2.1 or 2.9 or 3% instead of trying to project out 5 years?

JB: I think because we've just never approached this that way. When it was assigned originally it was lump sum and we were more focused on this trying to get the lump sums reset so that it would look like the program will balance then we were trying to create something that would add an automatic cost escalator when we aren't not certain how much cost will escalate. If we had had a cost escalator on this for the period 2006 through 2012. For the first 3 years of that our costs were increasing, but the next three years as we went through the recession our costs were flat. I think on something that is smaller like this the idea is there is a chance to have more distortion unless we want to go back, look at it and try to correct that distortion.

TH: The case studies that we've done, are we losing about 20% per permit?

JB: How did we study this? We looked at the number of events that happened on this in a fiscal year. We started working on this last fall so we looked at 3 fiscal years and then we each studied our expenses separately. Patrick and JB studied Code Enforcement, Don and his staff studied his and Bill and his staff studied his. We fed that through and Ruth and Ann put it all together into 3 studies and ran a composite and from there we predicted

what the gap was and then started to talk about how to cover it using different scenarios and finally some that ran up over 25% and we finally agreed to a 20% proposal which we thought got us close.

TH: Why is environmental conceding to a 20% loss?

JB: It's not a 20% loss it's the difference in how you look at recovering your costs. We just look at it differently and we thought that 20% would cover it for Bill and for us. Don thought that his would be higher but he agreed to stick with 20% if it worked for the other 2 departments.

TH: Not necessarily recouping 100%, but trying to get close?

DW: It's a joint fee and we are cooperating.

HS: If I had a 50 X 100 building, figure it one way it is an old dry cleaning operation and the same square footage but now I've got some hazardous liquids and probably some asbestos; doesn't seem like a square footage thing.

DW: Rick Nelson is here and he is our Senior Environmental Specialist regarding asbestos. The nature of the process for asbestos; primarily the burden is on the builder to do all the work and we are going out there to verify that it's done right. They've done the inspection and they have the paperwork. We are trying to recover the cost of the personnel because you might have a project that has 20 buildings in it and one project that has 1 and it's all over the board and that's just our methodology for doing the asbestos program.

TH: All you are really doing is overseeing the person responsible going through the right channels and hiring the right engineering and you are just blessing it.

DW: Primarily we are confirming they are complying with the MSHAP regulation. The general process is someone files a notice/permit saying we are going to demolish this building, we've done an asbestos inspection and we did/didn't find anything; if found we removed it and will take it for disposal. We will do an inspection on that site prior to demolition to ensure everything has been done correctly, talk to everyone we need to, make sure the form is done and then there is another part of it that is back and forth, it's a complicated rule and we recognize that so we help people a lot in filling out forms, etc. It is primarily the responsibility of the contractor, builder, and the demolisher.

JM: You are typically the one doing this, just for building, Anytime I pull a demo permit, I look at you as the expert I don't know how often you deal with demo permits or not but does this make sense to you?

JT: Is this 20% increase primarily relayed around demolition permits as a whole or more of the asbestos aspect?

DW: As JB pointed out in the cost analysis showing for the last 3 years between all of us there was \$156K that was not recouped that was part of the cost; we are just a piece of this fee; a common fee that works for everyone. The 20% looked a fair increase given the fact that we haven't been able to recoup costs and are trying to do that as we go forward.

JB: I would point out that just to remind everyone that the cover memo briefly summarized the study that Ruth helped us put together that showed from FY08-FY11 the 3 years we studied; while the revenue taken in was a little over \$870K and expenses were +\$1.27MM and that's the point we are trying to address. It's a much bigger issue for them than us because when you take that deficit rock and throw it in their pool; their pool is much smaller than our pool.

RB: That's 20% right? So 2013 you are going to be recovering your costs and in 2015 you are going to have a 2% loss and you will go down that slippery hill again till you get to 16 when you are going to be 20% and you are going to do this again right?

DW: I think you'd need to adjust fees again at some point in the future and as long as we maintain, it's a demo fee and it's in the ordinance we get a piece of whatever that is.

JB: Actually if you took 20% x 870 you would more than cover the gap that we've got now and that's the idea. It over covers it for 4 years and hopefully the whole thing balances out for 8 years. We have never tried to do this before but the idea was to not come back to you every 4 years, this is the first time that it has come back to you in 15 years and we didn't think we could forecast out 15 years but we thought we'd like to go out beyond 5.

JM: What are you asking us to do; approve this and say that we agree with it?

JB: I am asking you for a formal vote of support. Because it's in the LUESA Fee Ordinance, the BOCC would look to the BDC to see that they support it. As we discussed in house Cary and I thought it should come before you, you should have a chance to comment and then we would send to the BOCC as part of the FY13 Fee

Ordinance increases that the Department at large (LUESA) is advancing. Part of that is the Cost Recovery Work Group changes which you approved in February.

HS: I don't have a problem with 2% increase that is gradual also my issue is with 20%.

JT: 20% seems fairly high; it would be different if it was more like 10% of what you are saying.

--: What has been the primary drive of why there's been a loss, has it been the economy; not as many permits pulled and felt like there was a loss in revenue?

DW: For Air Quality; that's a part of it and the other part is just the length of time we have taken before we have come back before this body; it's the salary increases over time; ours is 95% salary driven and if you go 20 years or 15 years without having any increases but having increases in salary, so frankly in part it's Air Quality take some responsibility because this has had a bigger impact on us than anybody else which it hasn't come to Jim's attention until now because we have waited a long time to catch up.

--: Is there any recent standards or requirements having to do more inspections or work as it relates to the permits?

DW: No requirements to do anything additional it's totally driven by construction and goes up and down with that. For us we have to maintain a certain level of expertise just to have the program, so it's not like we can contract it or run it piece-milled by the amount of work just to have people that are knowledgeable about MSHAP and how to do it to coordinate with the state and the EPA and all we have to maintain a certain level of expertise in our personnel to do that and do it right.

JB: How many people do you have on staff total?

DW: 25 in Air Quality

JB: And you've already said the deficit rock splashes much bigger in his pool than ours which is a big part of it. To answer your question about 20% looks good, looks big except for it's been 15 years; he's very small and the reason we didn't see it is because it is a smaller item in our bucket and we didn't notice it. So Don came to us and said it's a real problem and in a budget that is much smaller than ours the gap he's suffering is a bigger challenge for him and so he asked us to work on it which is how we got here.

TH: A 1900sf structure that is being demoed is what \$400? - \$500? So we are talking a 70-80 increase?

JM: I've supported a lot of fee increases over the last 2 years but in raising the revenue I understood the cost structure very well, we had 242 on this boat and now we have 130+ and you can understand raising revenues to meet a new level of customer service and demand to support this, I won't say I am against it, but to support it I'd have to have a better understanding of cost structure. We've just increased fees 5% to fill in the valleys and now you are saying we need to pay another \$80 - \$250 every time you pull a demo permit; I get where it may be necessary but as a customer/consumer I don't understand the cost structure behind it well enough to say that I support it or I disapprove of it so I stand ambivalent on it because we don't look at those departments with the same detailed scrutiny that we understand the way Code Enforcement does business. I would as a customer (not sitting in this room) would say, this is a negative thing, why are we raising another fee; all we hear out of the building department is more fee increases when I haven't seen business to support it yet. I get where you are coming from, I think your arguments are clear and probably well founded I just have a hard time giving any opinion.

JB: Your point about us doing a lot of work to fill in the valleys is true.

JM: If I understood there was no way to wring out the cost, like when you are running a deficit in your department I know there is no further way to wring out any more cost because before I increase the fee that's charged I want to make sure the cost is in line with the most efficient delivery model I couldn't support it one way or the other.

DW: Our costs, time and effort we've not increased, it has taken us essentially 1.25 man years as long as we've been running the program and the cost is 1.25 over the time from 1997 to 2010 is personnel increase from that time till now has gone up. We're not covering that.

EM: We are the private sector and our costs have come down because we have 15% or 16% of the people we had before and we had to adjust our business.

DW: I don't understand how that's applicable the fact is its still taking that much to do the work.

JM: Is there a better way to do it technologically, is there a more efficient way to do it could combine departments and the answer is probably no but it just seems beyond the scope of this group to really comment on a department where we don't understand their cost structure. It's beyond my scope.

JB: Let me suggest that we could advance the proposal to the Manager's office without the BDC taking a position and see what they say and if the manager doesn't like that then we could come back and ask you folks to have a small group sit down with the group that studied this and I'll probably know an answer inside of a week, if it didn't work I could send an email around and ask for some volunteers to look at it with the same group that put all the numbers together except Ruth isn't here so it would be Amy and Ann trying to explain it.

TH: I think what they are saying is that the fact it's all encompassed in 1 we are actually getting a discount because, we have to pay EPA regardless, you as the consumer when you pull a demo permit so it's going

JM: I'm the owner representative we end up paying it but you guys understand it better. So that here your perspective

TH: They've got rules and regulations that they continue to advance and they are doing more work for our safety in Air Quality.

JM: Do you do some commercial work too but from purely a commercial perspective, do you have enough experience.

JT: It goes back; someone had asked the question about the laundry mat and why one structure might cost differently than another.

TH: It's an average cost.

JT: The con is the guy that has the fully contaminated soil; it's a big issue to remediate it. My biggest issue in the demolition permits are fairly a small cost; it's the least of the permitting cost structure when you go into a job it's more of the 20% factor that I would have to liked to see more of an incremental increase prior to this time instead of jumping right into 20%.

JB: A good part of that is our fault is because it just didn't hit our radar screen because we were busy trying to survive, do other things and it wasn't big enough to stand out to us until Don pointed it out to us.

RB: Can you get some comparison rates from Wake County and some of the surrounding areas to compare?

JB: One of the complications in doing that is it's almost impossible to compare apples to apples. The way we used to be structured is the way most counties are which a fractured fee structure. We consolidated all these in 1997 as a service to customers so instead of coming and having to pay us for a permit and pay Don for a permit and pay Bill for a permit and go several different places you came into one spot, we moved the paperwork around for you, you had to make them happy but you paid one fee. What's making it complicated now to study it because it comes out of an idea that it was an improvement in service for your folks that you didn't have to run all over? The time it would take to run all over would be far more than any discrepancy in consolidated fee.

JM: That addresses to a agree my concern with the cost structure because you made it more efficient with you consolidated, right and made our job easier so these guys didn't have to go 3 places. I hear the biggest concern from Rob and Jon is that 20% is a lot. Is there any way we could do 10% and 2.5% annual increases just to get to the same average and more closely monitor the cost?

GM: For the demolition permits, they have parked as a separate permit and they haven't been incorporated in our annual discussion every year, that we are going to go up another 2%, 3% or 5% and it's been 15 years or better it has been parked to the side so that if we increase it a percent every year we'd probably be asking for about the same thing we are asking for now.

TH: When we restructure budget every year why do we give the county an annual increase? It's not fair for them to not cover their salary cost.

RB: He will stay in the hole every year just from giving people raises if he maintains the staff.

DW: That is where we are just because of what has happened for whatever reason.

JM: What I'm hearing is general support; maybe I have an ambivalent, seems like the people that understand it, Harry thinks he'd support it maybe we should take it to a vote. Do I hear anybody saying that this is a horrible idea I fully oppose it?

RB: Is there a way to come to a compromise of 10%? If we haven't changed this reg in 15 years, someone has been running in the red for 10-15 years, can we do it at 10% then figure out a way to reallocate some money so that their costs can be recovered somewhere else? Seems like we are running in the black as an aggregate.

JB: We as in Code Enforcement are.

RB: Right but you are over them

JB: No they are separate, LUESA is a super-agency that's the official title of it and the Director is Cary Saul. Don answers to Cary Saul and Bill answers to Cary Saul the same way I answer to Cary Saul (and Dave Canaan) but we are independent entities. Our money is separate, we are a fee funded operation and our money is kept separate for a number of reasons not the least of which is we have a special reserve fund. He has his separate revenue sources and Bill actually uses County money.

DW: To be clear; we have the ability to set our own fees; we have the authority to come up with a separate MSHAP fee and this odd ball thing has thrown us all together. We could go out and do this on our own and wouldn't need to be talking to you. Not meant to be a threat; putting all these fees together makes it confusing for everyone. We do have our authority along with our own fee structure we have our own ordinance.

JM: What's your reaction to a 10% increase now and a 2.5% increase going forward so that you don't have to come back 8 years from now because we haven't addressed it?

JB: Sounds like 10% and a 2.5% for 4 years?

RB: What would it take to get them right?

JB: In another direction without studying it would get us to about the same spot; at 10% and 2.5% x 4. It would be 10% this year then add 2.5% next year; we would set up the structure now in 5 years it would get us to about where we thought we'd be. A motion like that would be appropriate if you choose to do so.

JM: I think you have to make a motion to approve the 10% increase to fee ordinance increased by 2.5% annually

RB: Do we want to do that or do we want you to come up with your number to figure out where you need to be whole for 2012 and 2013 and if that's 10, 9 or 8%, our recommendation would be regardless if you want to adjust it +/-.

JB: This is going to go before the BOCC late this month (28th) it would be good if we had a position; even if your position is slightly different than ours you indicate what you are comfortable with then we can take that into account.

DW: It brings us back to even and gives some growth so we don't have to come back to you. We actually did this with our permitting sources and we had a 2 phase approach.

RB: Mr. Bartl, with the numbers that you said was

JB: Our study showed that in the three year period our revenue was \$870,983 and our expenses were \$1,027,457 so on \$870k worth of revenue we had \$156,500 worth of loss so we were trying to pick that up. What Jon is pointing out if you do something at a 10% bump and then in response to JT there's an increment behind that goes up whether it's 2 or 2.5% for 4 years that's going to get you in the ball park and as Don said, these are estimates.

Harry Sherrill made the motion seconded by Rob Belisle for an increase of 10% for year one and a 2.5% increase for years two through five. The motion passed with one opposed.

5. REVISED BUDGED SPREADSHEETS

Jim shared that he promised the board last month that based on the actions that the board took on our request to add positions, that I would show you the impact in both the FY12 budget and the FY13 budget proposal so you have in your packet right behind your meeting notes two spreadsheets. The first one shows the impact of going from 134 staff to 142. You get there by going to the original budget one year ago. We discussed this with you in the budget the BDC supported a year ago was \$13,924,151 then we had a betterment in August of 2011 of \$319,250 when we added 5 positions and they just added another betterment on March 20th of 8 positions that was \$126,031 for the rest of the year and if you add all of that up it comes up to be \$14,369,432. This is the amended FY12 budget. You take the 142 positions and turn them into a requested base budget; and when you turn them in and you take into account all the other things we talked about in last month's meeting the base budget for the 142 positions in the FY13 proposal is \$16,142,782. We proposed and you supported that we add 2

more positions (originally the betterment was 10 positions; we advanced 8 of them now there is 2 left. Those 2 positions that are left total \$112,432; so the proposal to the Manager's Office will be that the total FY13 requested with the 2 betterments will be \$16,255,214. There is a variance between the top end that we talked to you about in the last meeting for two reasons; first of all the 8 positions because they are added this year actually pick up 4 pay periods in the next year which is about \$90k and there are some other things in here that were passed down to us by finance that we had to plug into the 4000 accounts that came up to about \$46k. That is how we get up to the \$16,255,214. As promised we would show you what the impact was of both your decisions, last month the decision by the BOCC how it affected FY12 amended budget and what that means as you will see moving forward to the Manager's Office. If you have questions you can come back to us; it should fit together the numbers that we showed you the last time if not I'm happy to sit down with anybody; it makes sense to me.

6. CODE ENFORCEMENT FY12 MID-YEAR WORKLOAD NUMBERS

Jim's handout includes numbers that he typically would have given out in January/February but due to being out did not pull them together until after the budget process. On the permits side of the handout is our permits are roughly on pace through the mid year; since then they have actually bumped up a bit if you take last three months into account it is up a bit. Permit counts were about the same as in FY11, the inspection counts were up about 10%, the inspection response times, inspection pass rates were down a bit and that is to be expected as inspection loads increase and they are up 10% we are working on increasing our staffing but we certainly have not increased our staffing 10% yet. Those IRTs and Pass Rates are down a bit. The big thing if you flip to the reverse side in the OnSchedule part what you'll see is something we have been talking about for a long time and that's the OnSchedule first review counts are up 14%. CTAC first review counts they are up 16%. The commercial activity that Patrick is seeing on his side is fairly healthy which we have talked about and the Budget Subcommittee took into account when we did all of our calculations for the coming year.

7. QUARTERLY REPORTS

Technical Advisory Board Quarterly Report

Willis Horton gave a brief report on the Technical Advisory Board saying that their quarterly meeting was held on March 21, 2012. Joe Weathers resided over the meeting that encompassed half of the active members. Guests were Heidi Pruess, Mecklenburg County and Patrick Cerri from Charlotte Douglass International Airport. Old business was covered by Lon McSwain, he discussed the Energy and Residential Codes as well as the adoption changes. Codes are now available for Residential and Energy through DOI or ICC. Willis and Lon attended the International Green Construction Code Conference in Phoenix, AZ. The hearings took place in the first week of November, the Green Code was approved and goes into effect on March 1st of this year; however, the code was not available until the first week of April. No move from the BCC on adoption of the Green Building Code.

Consistency Team Reports

Building Consistency Team held 3 residential and 3 commercial meetings and covered 17 topics. In March Mr. Bartl attended one of the meetings and presented the code transition in each of the meetings we have covered new requirements of the 2012 Residential Code. The residential code is well attended by the industry, commercial meetings we only have one or two designers. Electrical had 3 meetings total with 31 total topics. Plumbing and Mechanical each had 3 meetings with plumbing having 23 topics and mechanical having 22 topics to include 6 fuel/gas topics.

TH: You said the new building code is effective July?

LMc: June 1st.

JB: Commercial building and everything but residential and energy and electrical are triggered on June 1st; residential and energy was triggered march 1st and electrical is up in the air, actually the 2011 is up in the air.

Code Compliance Report

Joe Weathers shared that in the report you can see the previous quarter findings vs. the current quarter findings and looking at the comparison; if you look at the jobs not ready percentages; all of them were down in building mechanical and plumbing. Building at 7.18%, mechanical at 5.22%, plumbing 8.57% and electrical was up at 6.63% for the jobs not ready percentage of the total. Rough and finish percentages were split some up some down. Building is at 31.98 which is down 1.5%; finals were at 22.75% which is down 4.5%. Electrical roughs were at 18.08% which is up 3.7% and finals are down 62.96% which is down 2%, mechanical rough were up 25.74% up 3%, finals at 64.51% which is down 2.3%. Plumbing rough ends were standing at 26.46% which stayed the same and the finals are at 44.79 % which is down 2.5%.

Commercial Plan Review Report

Patrick shared with all that 74% of projects passed on the first review, 88% passed on the second review. Pass rate from the first review by trade, Building 86%, Electrical 91%, Mechanical 82% and Plumbing was 81%. In building, the most common defect examples were Appendix B, hardware, exit requirements, passive fire protection, AE seal. Found in electrical were Service/Feeders, branch circuits, grounding & bonding, over current protection, load calcs. In Mechanical were ventilation/exhaust, fresh Air Requirements, duct construction & materials, kitchen exhaust & MUA syst., equipment accessibility. In Plumbing was traps/interceptors, drain & pipe materials, system installation, vent stacks/main vent, fixture requirements. Approved as noted is at 29% for all trades the largest provider of approved as noted is County and City Fire at 86%. Critical path users are about 14%, electrical is 10%, mechanical is 17%, plumbing is 23%. Mechanical/plumbing is the same, electrical is down 3%, building is down 9%.

HS: Patrick, you've got appendix B appears to be almost doubled what everything else is?

PG: This is a code transition too and a lot of times I think folks are using the old appendix b so I think you are going to see that for the next 5 months. We are trying to remedy this with the controllers but folks are still using the old appendix b.

JB: The appendix b is very user unfriendly, unintuitive. In teaching professional practice at UNCC you could take someone that understood how to put a code analysis together, hand them an appendix b and they get completely confused which is part of the problem. Eventually we would like to automate it.

8. QUARTERLY BDC BULLETIN EXERCISE

Previous bulletin topics:

<p>April, 2010</p> <p>Fy11 budget presentation available</p> <p>Green Permit Rebates suspension</p> <p>Technical Advisory Board startup</p> <p>Fy11 budget presentation available</p>	<p>July, 2010</p> <p>Expanding TIP</p> <p>AE Pass Rate update</p> <p>Web tools for contractors</p> <p>Current inspection service levels</p> <p>2010 Reorg Field impact</p>	<p>October, 2010</p> <p>Why Meck County is a project asset</p> <p>Nissan ID's Meck process as best practice</p> <p>AE Pass Rate success</p> <p>Progress on reorg plan</p> <p>Field service improvements</p>	<p>January, 2011</p> <p>TAB purpose and customer participation</p> <p>Technology development and budget baseline</p> <p>Status of EV introduction</p> <p>Elec J-man program pilot</p> <p>Meckpermit.com changes</p>
<p>April, 2011</p> <p>BIM-IPD code change public hearing</p> <p>Cost Recovery Work Group startup</p> <p>Website redesign</p> <p>EPM development status</p>	<p>July, 2011</p> <p>Update on Senate Bill 22</p> <p>2012 NC Building Code transition stipulated by BCC</p> <p>TU/LCU/CC/TCO/CO changes in process and fees</p> <p>NACO awards</p>	<p>October, 2011</p> <p>Carbon Monoxide alarm requirements</p> <p>Cost Recovery Work Group status</p> <p>2012 NC Building Code transition</p> <p>Changes in temporary utility</p>	<p>January, 2012</p> <p>2012 Code transition</p> <p>CRWG Final Report</p> <p>EPS-EPR startup</p> <p>Permit revenue trends</p> <p>Website redesign</p>

Permit activity and related inspect response times	AE Pass Rate Incentives status	process	
Impact of Senate Bill 22	Fy11 key data points		
April, 2012			
Residential Code – direct links, clear direction, MCCEs approach-diplomatic			
Cut off of Commercial Transition Period			
Budget – trends seen in revenue and proposal for the added position, emphasis on staying ahead of curve (more permits, inspections, DNC, apts., revenue)			

9. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT

Statistics Report

Permit Revenue

- March permit (only) revenue- \$1,435,293, compares to February revenue of \$1,361,488.
- FY12 budget projected monthly permit revenue; \$12,001,001/12 = \$1,000,083 x 9 = \$9,000,747.
- At 3/31/12, YTD permit rev of \$11,654,796 is above permit fee rev projection by \$2.654M, or 29%+.

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- March total - \$217,370,609, with YTD amount \$2,093,232,360
- FY11Total at March – \$1,120,849,888
- So YTD figure is approximately 89% above our construction value permitted YTD at March, 2011

Permits Issued:

	February	March	3 Month Trend
Residential	2845	4010	2299/2854/2845/4010
Commercial	2319	2576	2322/2402/2319/2576
Other (Fire/Zone)	492	561	398/399/499/561
Total	5656	7147	5019/5655/5656/7147

- Residential up 37%; commercial up 11%; total up 26%
- SF detached new construction permits YTD at 1676 vs. 1366 at 3/31/11, so up 22.7%-

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	Feb	Mar	Insp. Perf.	Feb	Mar	% Change
Bldg.	4264	4478	Bldg.	4186	4417	+5.5%
Elec.	4603	5142	Elec.	4617	5130	+11.1%
Mech.	2595	2921	Mech.	2592	2935	+13.2%
Plbg.	2127	2243	Plbg.	2117	2211	+4.44%

- October, 10: 158- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
- November, 10: 154- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94% all trades, 94.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 10: 149- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 74.5% all trades, 80% B/E/M/P only
- January, 11: 137- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 82.65% all trades, 83.5% B/E/M/P only
- February, 11: 136- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 86.6% all trades, 88% B/E/M/P only
- March, 11: 185 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 85.75% all trades, 84.5% B/E/M/P only
- April, 11: 147- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 78.37% all trades, 84.8% B/E/M/P only
- May, 11: 196- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 98.5% all trades, 85.5% B/E/M/P only
- June, 11: 251- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.5% all trades, 94.2% B/E/M/P only
- July, 11: 175- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.25% all trades, 93.75% B/E/M/P only
- August, 11: 238- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 94.75% B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 11: 219 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.25% all trades, 96.5% B/E/M/P only
- October, 11:176-1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.75% all trades, 96.25% B/E/M/P only
- November, 11:184 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.75% all trades, 93.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 11:143 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- January, 2012:136 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–78% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- February, 12:139 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–74.88% all trades, 73% B/E/M/P only
- March, 12:127 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–86.25% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only

Notes regarding on time / early

- BEMP improved 14% over last month, much closer to 90% goal.
- All trades improved as well.
- Still need to closely monitor, but appears we're getting our sea legs on EPS-EPR.

Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on April 2, 2012, showed
 - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-3 work day booking lead, except County Zoning at 4 days, elec &Health at 7 days, and City Zoning at 17 days
 - 3-4 hour projects; at 2-4 work days lead time, except bldg & M/P at 5 days, elec at 7 days, Health at 14 days and City Zoning at 19 days.
 - 5-8 hour projects; at 3-5 work days lead time, except elec at 11 days, CMUD at 10 days, Health at 14 days and City Zoning at 19 days
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; 4 days for BEMP, 2-3 days for all other
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 6 work days for small projects, 15 work days for large

Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

March Meeting Follow-up

Confirm revised budget numbers based on BOCC's March 20 action on the RFBA

LUESA Fee Ordinance change on demo fees

CRWG detail work continues.

- A meeting is scheduled for May 1, 2012 from 9:00 – 11:00 with a sub-comm of the CRWG
- Work will include refining the following CRWG Final Report topics.
 - Item 1 regards 'note d' incorporating 'Upfit Construction Permit Value Calculator' into the permit fee calculation process. Need to develop/agree on a formula.
 - Item #5, regarding the cost of incremental service in field inspections, developing inspection limit counts.
 - Item #18, regarding "owner as contractor" added inspections, developing inspection limit counts
 - Bring consensus recommendations on the above back to the BDC in a future meeting.

CRWG Public Information Plan (for use if/after BOCC approves the RFBA)

- Staff is developing a public info strategy, addressing the following:
 - The problem that the RFBA is written in government language. Need to develop a simple and thorough explanation to customers in their terms, whether they are experienced or novice customers.
 - This is to include a sound bite description, as emphasized by Jon Morris.
- Will have comprehensive strategy of components and timing, for discussion with BDC in May.

EV Car Qualified List of Engineers/Contractors and Other

Joe shared a handout with the BDC members showing Centralina Clean Fuels Coalition. In the handout shows a timeline of everything that has happened concerning electric vehicles in this area and one of the major highlights is that in December the Centralina Clean Fuels Coalition petitioned the department of energy for a \$500k grant which we received; that money is being shared by what is called the Mountains to Sea initiative consists of land, sky area for Asheville region, greater Charlotte, Piedmont Triad, State University and Triangle J area, all 4 of these entities with cooperation and backing from advance energy and duke energy is pushing forward with a lot of initiatives this money is to be used for infrastructure, readiness, and awareness; not for the actual purchase of infrastructure but for planning and getting folks educated and aware that the vehicles are coming and what barriers or obstacles that may stand in their way or be a part of their planning that they need to look at as far as getting electric vehicle readiness for their area. One of the big things we've had input from the state of Florida and Richmond, VA, they've already got theirs up and going. Some of the things they are doing is they petitioned the legislature for a ruling on parking in electric vehicle spaces. Legislature says you cannot park a gasoline vehicle in a charging vehicle parking space and how long you can park and those types of things which will be a big issue. The city of Raleigh has a local ordinance that says if you are in that space you also have to have the charger connected so they realize you are actually charging or else you could be fined. That is one of the big obstacles out there because you have those empty spaces close to the building where others want to park. The group has broken down into 5 different categories. Jim and I have been part of the Policy Codes and Standards Committee; they also have a Vehicles Group, an Infrastructure Group, and Incentives Group, Economic Development Group and an Education and Outreach. Different entities all over the state have put project leaders on each one of these tasks and all of us have to work back toward responding to DOE with their requirements for fulfilling them giving us the \$500k. The work is continuing, we're having monthly meetings, we have a Revac group which is local, Policy Codes and Standards is within that group and then the statewide group and we meet several times a month and a lot. Last meeting at UNCC where video conference with Asheville, Raleigh, Triad and us.

HS: Joe what kind of cost does one charging station cost?

JW: One we saw from Eaton, \$3000 for just the station

JB: More important are the residential because 95%+ are residential stations. The commercials are by far the rare exception.

HS: There are some that can only go 15 miles without charging which is why I am asking.

JW: The range anxiety is one of the things they are trying to get over so once you leave the house; where do I plug it in. On their web site mentioned in the paperwork, they are trying to give you information on where all of the charging stations are located so that as you are out and about you can plan your route knowing you will be near a recharge.

GM: Residential chargers w/ Eaton that you can put in your home right now for the class 1 are priced at \$600. Those folks will go to the next model because the quickness of charge.

Manager/CA Added Comments

Jeff Griffin: We've got 6 field inspector positions we have gone through the interviews, the panel selected 5 individuals, we reposed the remaining position. This week we are making offers to candidates; we expect to have the 5 positions filled by the May 2nd deadline. They will consist of 2 electrical, 2 multi-trade and 1 building inspector.

Tim Taylor: We also have one CTAC plans examiner position and we hope to have it filled by May 2nd as well.

Chuck Walker: Put together a program to expedite apartments coming through our system, one of the options given to some of these projects was that they could book ahead of time their second review when they are not going to get approved on the first cycle. They can book the 2nd review ahead of time as an express review. We had one of those since the BDC last met; it was an intense 2 days of express review all trades got through and approved. Building took the whole 2 days but it was a successful approval on the 2nd review cycle of a very large apartment complex.

10. Adjournment

The April 17th, 2012 Building-Development Commission meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Note: The next BDC Meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 15th, 2012.